

**Minutes of the Regular Planning Board Meeting
Monday, February 25, 2008**

1. CONVENE: 7:03 p.m.
2. FLAG SALUTE: Vice President Kohlstrand.
3. ROLL CALL: President Cook, Vice President Kohlstrand, Board Members Cunningham, Ezzy Ashcraft, Lynch, and McNamara.

Also present were Planning Services Manager Andrew Thomas, Assistant City Attorney Farimah Faiz; Planner III Dennis Brighton.

4. MINUTES:
 - a. Minutes for the meeting of November 13, 2007.

These minutes will be considered on March 10, 2008.

- b. Minutes for the meeting of February 11, 2008 (not available).

These minutes will be considered on March 10, 2008.

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION: None.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

- a. Future Agendas

Mr. Thomas provided an update on future agenda items.

President Cook noted that she left the Measure A meeting considering how it would fit into the Housing Element, and would like to see a presentation on how the Housing Element would be updated, and how it fit into the State Density Bonus Ordinance and the Secondary Unit Ordinance amendments.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she had heard numerous comments on the educational nature of the Measure A forum, and that they wished to have more presentations in the future. She believed that a weeknight evening would be good for most people.

Board Member Lynch wished further clarification on the input requested from the Planning Board members. He was concerned about the budget and time impacts of additional work requested of staff; he noted that the budget was set for the current work

plan and believed there would be unintended consequences from that additional work. He did not want to micromanage the department.

Board Member Lynch believed it would be helpful to put this project within a critical path with various milestones, in order to know when the work product must be brought to the department within the term of the contract. He requested that staff share the schedules with the Planning Board.

Board Member Cunningham requested that the March 10 meeting include some time to examine lessons learned from the forum which he believed should be addressed, other than the Housing Element. He would like to discuss use issues in particular.

Board Member McNamara inquired about the status of the additional Planning Board member. Mr. Thomas replied that the position had been advertised, and that Mayor Johnson was considering her options.

b. Zoning Administrator Report

Mr. Thomas provided the Zoning Administrator report.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATION:

Mr. Bill Smith discussed the development opportunities in Alameda.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

- 8-A. V07-0006 (Variances) and DR07-0056 (Major Design Review) – 3327 Fernside Blvd.** the applicant requests Variance and Design Review approval to enlarge an existing single-family home located within an R-2, Two-family Residential Zoning District. Continued from January 28, 2008. **Recommended for continuance.**

Vice President Kohlstrand moved to continue this item.

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Noes: 0 Absent: 0; Abstain – 0. The motion passed.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

- 9-A. DR07-0080 – 1629 Webster Street.** The applicant requests a Major Design Review approval to construct an approximately 8,274-square foot, two-story, mixed use building to be located on the southwesterly corner of Webster Street and Pacific Avenue. The ground floor area would be divided into retail space. The second floor would be composed of two dwelling units and a separate

office/storage area. The applicants are also requesting approval to permit the payment of parking in-lieu fees. The site is located within a C-C, Community Commercial Zoning District. (DB)

Mr. Brighton summarized the staff report. Staff recommended approval of this item. WABA had requested that an additional condition of approval be added to require the installation of awnings at the street frontage buildings prior to occupancy of the building. Staff concurred with that request.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member McNamara whether the conditions requested by WABA replaced the conditions previously stipulated, Mr. Brighton replied that was essentially the case. He added that the previous conditions applied to an earlier plan set submittal.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that it would be helpful to receive the materials sooner in advance of the meeting, and suggested sending PDF files by email. She would like additional time to review the materials.

President Cook advised that nine speaker slips had been received.

Board Member Cunningham moved to limit the speakers' time to three minutes.

Board Member McNamara seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Noes: 0 Absent: 0; Abstain – 0. The motion passed.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. John Piziali, former Planning Board President, spoke in support of this project as a West End resident and WABA member. He believed this would be a special project, which he believed to be the first mixed use project on the street. He expressed concern about the parking requirements and the in lieu fees, which he believed were excessive; he believed those requirements often stifled new projects. He would like to see the requirements scaled to the project, which was a strain on smaller projects.

Ms. Doreen Soto, City of Alameda Development Services Department, Alameda County Improvement Commission, City Hall West, spoke in support of this project. She noted that they had worked with this applicant for about two years, and noted that it had been a difficult project with respect to the parking. They hoped that they would be able to bring new parking regulations forward soon. She believed this was a very good infill project that maximized the site with a mix of retail and housing uses. She believed this project would create new jobs, and encouraged the Planning Board to approve this project.

Ms. Kathy Moehring, Executive Director, WABA, spoke in support of this project. She noted that she had worked on this project with the Webster Street Design Committee. She noted that the applicant had been gracious and easy to work with in addressing the

Design Committee's concerns. She believed this project was needed on Webster Street in order to establish a viable commercial district.

Mr. Thomas Keenan, 617 Pacific, spoke in opposition to this project, and displayed several photos of the site. He believed that there were several unresolved hazardous materials occurrences on the site that had not been remediated or placed on the public record. He noted that with respect to Item 2, the fire station along Webster Street on the south side had a red curb adjacent to that location, and if cars were to park in that area, there would not be sufficient space for the fire trucks to exit. He noted that several months before, Alameda Party and Play, located across the street, had been approved with no additional required parking because it was an existing building. He believed that when that building is occupied, the parking problems would increase on the street. He noted that the closest unmetered parking space was 260 feet west on Pacific Avenue on the opposite side of the street. He added that there would be no space for the additional trash receptacles or Dumpsters that would be required.

Ms. Beverly Miranda, 630 Pacific, spoke in opposition to this project. She noted that she supported progress, and would like to see this project work out; however, she was concerned about workers from the nearby businesses parking in front of her and her neighbors' houses. She noted that several times, people had parked in her driveway because there was no parking available. She would like to see this part of Alameda improved with the proposed design, but not without sufficient parking.

Mr. Derek Pavlik, WABA Design Committee, 2875 Glascock Street, spoke in support of this project. He noted that Mr. Koka had invited their input throughout the process in the four years since he had been on the committee; he noted that he was the most willing design collaborator he had worked with.

Ms. Tricia Collins-Levi, 634 Eagle Avenue, spoke in support of this project. She believed this kind of project would move Webster Street in the right direction; she understood the parking issues, and hoped the issue of the fees would be worked out. She noted that the applicant had worked very hard on this project, and believed it would have a positive effect on the neighborhood.

Ms. Jackie Keenan, 617 Pacific, believed that the site still needed to be remediated from its use as a gas station. She noted that there was existing parking on Webster, and that there was no place for additional parking. She noted that additional parking on Pacific could not conflict with the red curb next to the fire station. She noted that it was a constant problem trying to discourage people from parking in their driveways. She noted that on several occasions, she had not received notices from the City with respect to this project.

Mr. Sam Koka, applicant, 802 Pacific Avenue, described the proposed project and noted that he had worked closely with the Webster Street Design Committee.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

President Cook requested that staff address the hazmat, parking, waste and noticing issues.

Mr. Brighton noted that this project had a 300-foot notification radius, which extended to 626 Pacific Avenue. He noted that there were two outdoor waste storage areas between the building and Mr. Koka's property, which would be able to accommodate small waste bins that would be typical for such a use.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff would craft a condition regarding the red zone, and that the analysis in the staff report had been discussed extensively with the Public Works Department. He added that the Design Review Team (DRT) had addressed that issue, including the fire department. He noted that it could be conditioned to reconfirm that the two additional spaces would be available on the street, and if not, the project could be conditioned to provide the two spaces on-site, which he believed would be virtually impossible. Alternatively, the in-lieu fees would be increased. He recommended that an additional condition be included with respect to hazmats, that it be confirmed to the effect that no building permit should be issued that would impede or prevent either the ongoing monitoring, or if there was a tank that must be removed, that it be taken care of before the building is built.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that it was not just the presence of a tank, but any leakage or plumes must be properly addressed.

Board Member Lynch believed that the Planning Board must remain mindful of the requirements originating from regulatory agencies. He added that certain requirements will have to be met for the property to be insurable.

Board Member Cunningham believed this was an excellent project which would be a good fit on Webster Street. He believed that the requirement for parking may be adjusted upon receipt of the permit, and did not know how that would align with the parking ordinances and the timeline.

Board member Cunningham assumed that with respect to the amendment to the use permit for SK Auto, they had been consulted and that they were in agreement.

Mr. Thomas noted that Mr. Koka owned that property as well.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member Cunningham, Mr. Thomas replied that a condition of approval should be added stating that prior to the issuance of building permits, that the Webster Street treatment would turn the corner to where it would meet with the Otaez Building. Board Member Cunningham noted that could be worked out by the design applicant, but wanted to ensure that the materiality was consistent. He wanted to ensure that the glazing would be clear, and without tint.

Vice President Kohlstrand echoed Board member Cunningham's comments, and believed this project would be a good fit for Webster Street. She was excited to see mixed use projects like this, and that it was able to replicate some of the historic features of Alameda's commercial streets that had residential units above ground floor retail. She supported reducing the parking requirements in the business districts, because she did not think by developing a surface parking lot for each use would provide the most effective use of the commercial streets in town.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Kohlstrand regarding parking requirements, Mr. Thomas described the uses for the in-lieu fees, including leasing additional public parking spaces, expanding existing lots or adding new satellite lots in the area, in addition to transit improvements. He added that the possibility of a permit parking system was one alternative that was still unresolved; he noted that the neighbors' input would be gathered as well.

Board Member McNamara shared the opinions of the other Board members in terms of supporting this project, and appreciated WABA's input in terms of the detailed information, criteria and conditions they had provided to staff. She also appreciated the change to the awnings, acknowledging that they were a very important part of this element. She also agreed that the certificate of occupancy not be awarded until the awnings were put up. She believed this was a good use of the street and the space, and believed the City needed to be very aggressive in providing some off-street public parking lots. She added that there were no such lots on the same side of Lincoln. She empathized with the neighbors experiencing the parking problems, and encouraged them to call a towing company when people parked in their driveways.

President Cook suggested looking into residence parking stickers to protect the residents of the neighborhood. Mr. Thomas noted that would be possible.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she supported the concept, and believed this project would be a significant improvement over the existing vacant lot. She sympathized with the neighbors who lived just outside the 300-foot radius, and requested that they be included in any further noticing on this project. She suggested that WABA sponsor further neighborhood meetings. She would condition the approval on having sufficient proof that the hazardous material issue had been resolved. She noted that Condition 5 read, "...and location of the transformers to service these loads must be approved by the Bureau of Electricity before building permit issuance."

President Cook agreed that the Planning Board needed to have input on the location of the transformers, and suggested that a condition be added that they be hidden from public view. Mr. Thomas replied that similar conditions had been modified for Alameda Landing, stating that the transformers should be screened and not located on the public right of way. He noted that they may be located behind the building, adjacent to the auto use, and not on Webster or Pacific.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft agreed with Mr. Piziali's assessment that the parking in lieu fees of almost \$90,000 were excessive. She suggested that an adjustment could be made retroactively. She noted that the language in the resolution on page 2 read, "The City is able to utilize the parking in lieu fees for parking and transit projects within the Webster Street commercial corridor..." She noted that page 4 of the staff report stated that funds would be used to lease spaces at a satellite lot, or to support transit services and facilities in the area. She would like to change the language to state on the resolution, "The City *shall* utilize the parking in lieu fees ..." She would like to see the in lieu fees only fund transit projects, transit services and facilities in the area. She noted that shuttles to BART were needed to get people out of their cars during commute hours.

Board Member Lynch wished to address parking in lieu fees, and based on his own professional experience, \$6,000 was very inexpensive for a parking space. He realized the developer was not expected to pay the full cost of the parking spaces, but to use public dollars assist in that project. He would not support any reduction of the parking in lieu fees because of the greater public good.

President Cook noted that she was not prepared to condition the dollars on transit in this area, because it was well-served by transit and less well-served by parking spaces. In general, she would like more information when such a suggestion is made for parking. She noted that there were a lot of buses running along this route already.

In response to an inquiry by President Cook whether there were any plans to extend the treescape up to the project to maintain consistency in the landscaping, Mr. Brighton replied that there were fresh trees along Webster Street in front of the site. He noted that there may be one space for a tree; staff would check with Public Works to confirm that item.

President Cook noted that the 100-foot height limit was in effect for this area, and she suggested that be examined before a future applicant considered a building of 100 feet in that location. She inquired whether it was a remainder from the 1970s, and suggested that it be brought down before it became an issue. She noted that she was in favor of this project, which addressed a number of issues that Board had discussed. She noted that it reflected the discussion held at the forum regarding the importance of placing residential use above retail or office in the business districts. She believed it supported the businesses, and kept the streets safer because of the 24-hour presence of people in the vicinity. She understood the neighbors' concerns about parking, and noted that it was the downside of enjoying a mix of uses in Alameda. She believed the City should work to find a place for the parking, and to enforce parking violations described by the neighbors.

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that she supported transit, but would not support the proposal by Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft regarding transit because she believed the areas transitioning from low to moderate density needed time to do so. She noted that shelters and street furniture had been enhanced in recent years, and believed the City should look at ways to consolidate the off-street parking. She did not believe the density was present to propose a structure right away. She believed there should be some off-

street lots, perhaps along the side streets or on Webster Street that will accommodate a broad range of uses. She did not believe the in lieu fees should be limited to transit funding at this point.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft understood Vice President Kohlstrand's concerns, and suggested that an eventual parking permit system be instituted. She noted that the enforcement of the parking restrictions were an important part of the process.

Board Member Lynch believed it was very important to examine and clarify the enforcement policy for the City. He hoped that Parking Enforcement had not been aware of this issue, and that they become aware of it going forward.

President Cook moved to adopt the draft Planning Board Resolution to approve a Major Design Review approval to construct an approximately 8,274-square foot, two-story, mixed use building to be located on the southwesterly corner of Webster Street and Pacific Avenue. The ground floor area would be divided into retail space. The second floor would be composed of two dwelling units and a separate office/storage area. The applicants are also requesting approval to permit the payment of parking in-lieu fees. Conditions will be added regarding:

1. The transformers;
2. Clear glazing;
3. The red no-parking zone;
4. The hazardous materials;
5. The design details to wrap around the corner, and there will be coordination between the two façades; and
6. The awnings will be installed prior to building occupancy; and
7. Trash enclosures.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff would confirm that the two parking spaces would be available. If not, they would be added to the parking in lieu fee.

Board member Cunningham seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 6. Noes: 0 Absent: 0; Abstain – 0. The motion passed.

Mr. Thomas noted that staff would work with WABA with respect to the parking issues.

9-B. PLN07-0061 – SRM Associates – 2800 Harbor Bay Parkway. Applicant requests a Final Development Plan, Major Design Review, Planned Development Amendment for reduced parking, and Tentative Map approval for the construction of ten new office buildings totaling approximately 109,280 square feet in floor area with a total of 384 parking spaces to be constructed on a 9.22 acre site. The site is located within the C-M-PD, Commercial Manufacturing, and Planned Development Zoning District. (DV)

Mr. Thomas presented the staff report on Mr. Vu's behalf. Staff recommended that the Planning Board approve the Final Development Plan, Major Design Review, Planned Development Amendment for reduced parking, and that the Planning Board recommend approval of the Tentative Map to City Council, as shown in the staff report.

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Joe Ernst, SRM Associates, applicant, displayed a PowerPoint presentation, and described the background, scope and layout of this proposed project. He displayed the colors and materials board, and described the canopies on the five buildings. He noted that the ability to create unit ownership was a unique element, and that a condo map would be put on each building. He noted that the buildings would be broken into flats, and the addition of stairs within the units would be very inefficient. He noted that there would be no middle unit, and that each unit would have three open sides.

Mr. Brian Tremper, President, Freport Homeowners Association, 232 McDonnell Road, noted that he was speaking as a resident, although this project had been discussed by the homeowners association. He noted that many of their comments had been addressed with SRM already, particularly screening the parking lot, with the exception of the view corridors. He inquired how the landscaping would be maintained once the transfer has taken place. He believed the lagoon was poorly maintained, and noted that no large trucks would be allowed. He was concerned about the restaurant, and felt that would be a difficult location for a restaurant, and compared it to Zazu's, next to KTVU in Oakland. He was concerned about late-night noise if a restaurant were to operate there, and requested that limits be placed. He expressed concern about the noise from the bus stop, which was scheduled to be at the intersection of the access road and Harbor Bay Parkway.

Mr. Eddie Chin expressed concern about the design for the back access road, which would flow into the Harbor Bay parking lot.

The public hearing was closed for Board discussion.

"In response to an inquiry by President Cook whether this use was required to be located *at this site, or whether it could be used for other uses such as residential in a business park*, Mr. Thomas replied that the site was office use but there were limits on the allowed intensity of use; this intensity was well within the upper limit."

In response to an inquiry by President Cook whether this use was required to be located at this site or whether it could be used for other uses such as residential, Mr. Thomas replied that the site was office use but there were limits on the allowed intensity of use, this intensity was well within the upper limit. With respect to airport noise, he noted that the newer generations of aircraft were becoming quieter, but that noise was a big issue at every airport.

Board Member Lynch disagreed with the comments regarding the swapping the parcels, and believed the amount of signatures of individuals coming forth would be significant.

He believed the project was stunning, and appreciated the community coming forward; he believed the City should heed their suggestions. He believed the conditions were reasonable. He believed this was a beautiful commercial project, which was what the land use was intended for.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft commended Mr. Vu for a well-written, well-organized and concise staff report. She noted that she was mindful of the need for revenue coming into the City to replace the revenue lost by the departure of the car dealerships. She supported clean, green businesses and appreciated the sustainable design exhibited by the applicant. She believed this would be an environmentally friendly project. She noted that the 25-foot-wide access road also had shared bike lane space, and believed that was a minimal lane. She inquired whether it would be widened. Mr. Thomas replied that the proposal was to maintain the basic 25-foot width curb to curb.

Mr. Ernst noted that the width varied, and that there was no curb on the west edge. He noted that there were pinch points that were less than 25 feet. He noted that as the new road is constructed, the minimum width would be 25 feet; he noted that there would be several areas where it would be wider than 25 feet. He noted that it was part of the parking area, and that it was not intended to be a through street. He noted that they wished to narrow the road somewhat to slow the transit buses down.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she understood the traffic calming provided by a narrower street, but was concerned about safety and would like to see alternate forms of transportation encouraged. She liked the presence of the bicycle parking.

Mr. Ernst noted that he was not a traffic engineer, but that the parking at the ferry terminal, which was denser than this use, did not have any operational problems. He added that the buses traveled through the parking lot without problems.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft hoped the parking would be screened from the homes on McDonnell across the lagoon, and from the Bay Trail, and noted that the landscaping plan seemed to indicate that. In response to her inquiry regarding the current vacancy rate, Mr. Ernst replied that the business park's vacancy rate was 14%, down from the low 20s several years ago. He noted that it was lower than Marina Village, as well as the City vacancy rate. He noted that this project evolved from the demand for a commercial site with lower density and the ability for the business owners to own their space as well.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft strongly suggested that a restaurant be located near the project. She believed it would make sense to have a Peet's coffee shop in the area as well. She noted that the nearby trail was well-used during the weekends, and added that the new hotel's clients would also appreciate those amenities.

Mr. Ernst noted that there were two other restaurant opportunities along the waterfront in addition to this project, including the hotel. He hoped that critical mass could be reached so the restaurant would be viable.

Board Member McNamara noted that Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft had addressed many of her concerns, including the width of the access road. She believed the applicant had worked closely with the homeowners and addressed their concerns. She believed the area would need restaurants, that the project was well-thought out and well-designed, and she supported this project.

Vice President Kohlstrand echoed the previous statements, and believed this was a wonderful project for the site. She was pleased to see the amount of effort put forth in working with the staff and the residents. She also liked the sensitivity shown towards the waterfront, as well as incorporating the LEED elements into the project. She liked the design as well. She did not like the amount of surface parking, but understood that it had to be there. She believed the roadway was strangely designed, and noted that people use the ferry parking lot like a through road. However, she did not know whether there were any options to correct it at this point. She suggested that a bike lane be added, and cited Portland and Emeryville as examples of using wide bioswale treatments in more urban settings, where much less space was used to provide drainage. She would like to see more space made available for bicyclists and pedestrians, and encouraged the applicant to make the parking lot as safe as possible as the amount of traffic increased.

In response to an inquiry by Vice President Kohlstrand whether the BART shuttle stopped in the business park, Mr. Ernst replied that the business park had its own TSM, including a BART shuttle, which was added when AC Transit took away the express shuttle. He noted that the business park sponsored the shuttle. They agreed to increase the size of the bus this past year, and will go to two buses in July 2008. She liked the fact that the applicant had provided some flexibility in the site for the restaurant use.

Board member Cunningham complimented the applicant on a job well done, and noted that he would like to push the bar higher if possible. In response to his inquiry regarding the LEED rating, Mr. Ernst replied that they currently had LEED certification, and had identified 28 points, which would place them at the LEED Silver rating.

In response to an inquiry by Board Member Cunningham regarding the site lighting, Mr. Ernst replied that the lighting would be designed to a LEED standard for residential light pollution, which was a stricter standard than commercial. He noted that they intended to maintain a safe level of lighting on the site, but not light up the residents' back yards. He added that they would use low-voltage landscape lighting.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham regarding the transformers, Mr. Ernst replied that they had some space constraints. He added that they met with AP&T and located the transformers; the transformers must be a certain distance away from the buildings. The location of the transformers took precedence, and the trash enclosures were placed on the opposite side of the building.

In response to an inquiry by Board member Cunningham regarding placing a landscaping agreement in the development agreement, Mr. Ernst replied that everything east of the road was maintained by the business park. He added that it was maintained by the

landscape and lighting district administered by the City, and noted that the irrigation would be upgraded this year, and that the dead plant material would be replaced with new plantings.

Board member Cunningham noted that Condition 29 suggested participation in the TSM program, and recommended that it be strengthened to require participation in the TSM program.

Mr. Ernst noted that the Harbor Bay Business Park already included participation in the TSM as part of the development agreement and the PD.

Board Member Lynch noted that the question was whether the City plan was deed-restricted, as were the CC&Rs. If it was a condition of the CC&Rs, it would be deed-restricted.

Board member Cunningham inquired whether the applicant had considered natural ventilation for these buildings, and noted that it would be a good place to have a showcase in Alameda of a naturally ventilated office park.

Mr. Ernst replied that the mechanical systems will all have economizers to switch to use natural ventilation. He noted that the window systems will be designed to be operable. He noted that if the windows were opened, the doors must be closed, because the airplanes spread noise throughout the space. He noted that had not been designed into the space yet.

Board member Cunningham inquired whether showers would be provided for bicyclists, and encouraged the applicant to do so. Mr. Ernst replied that their green specifications included that feature as well; he added that several of their buyers had done so in their own plans. He added that they had a confirmed Silver rating, and may be able to achieve a Gold LEED rating.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft noted that she would like to see a copy of the applicant's green specifications.

A discussion of the road width and right of way ensued.

Vice President Kohlstrand believed the ferry terminal road would be the biggest problem.

Mr. Thomas noted that if the road were to be built to City standards, it would be significantly wider.

Board Member Lynch noted that if it were a City road, Public Works would not be likely to want to take on the road's maintenance because of the cost.

President Cook noted that page 13, paragraph 1, should be changed to read, "."

President Cook noted that there were many positive aspects to the project, and appreciated the applicant's willingness to work with the City and the neighborhood over the course of the project. She was uncomfortable with the first set of findings on pages 1 and 2, that the project would be compatible with the adjacent surroundings, providing harmonious transitions between different designated land uses. She felt that the site was more clustered and walled off the water, with an insufficient relationship back to the community. She believed this project was similar to Alameda Landing in that it was a waterfront site approved for a lot of commercial office use, but it did not incorporate significant public access and recreation. She noted that both projects had a sea of parking, but that Alameda Landing incorporated public access and recreation opportunities in a way that provides a reason for the public to be there at night and on the weekends, to keep it safe and active. While she liked the project, she felt it was somewhat disconnected from the waterfront environment and cut the community off from the shores. She also felt that there was not a harmonious transition from the parking on the north through the site to the south. Finally, she felt that there should be a safer and more efficient road for bikes and cars through the Ferry Terminal rather than the undersized private access road now there.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft would like to see Condition 13 modified to read, "The final landscape plan for the area between the eastern edge of the private ferry access road and the sidewalk along the lagoon shall comply with Bay-friendly landscaping guidelines, as set forth by StopWaste.org." She noted that because the property was on the waterfront, anything put on the landscaping would be safe to run off into the water.

Vice President Kohlstrand moved to adopt draft Planning Board Resolution to approve a Final Development Plan, Major Design Review, Planned Development Amendment for reduced parking for the construction of ten new office buildings totaling approximately 109,280 square feet in floor area with a total of 384 parking spaces to be constructed on a 9.22 acre site. The following modifications will be added:

1. Page 5, Item 13: A reference to Bay Friendly landscaping will be incorporated;
2. Page 7, Item 29: A modification to the Harbor Bay TSM program will be incorporated;
3. Prior to issuance of permits, staff will work with the applicant to look at ways to minimize the width of the bioswale for the purpose of providing more width for the curb-to-curb for bicycles and pedestrians; underground mechanical solutions should be avoided. Lane width will not be added for vehicles;
4. The transformers will be screened; and
5. Showers will be encouraged as part of the TSM program.

Board Member Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 5. Noes: 1 (Cook); Absent: 0; Abstain – 0. The motion passed.

Vice President Kohlstrand moved to adopt draft Planning Board Resolution to approve the Tentative Map for the construction of ten new office buildings totaling approximately

109,280 square feet in floor area with a total of 384 parking spaces to be constructed on a 9.22 acre site.

Board Member Cunningham seconded the motion, with the following voice vote – 5. Noes: 0; Absent: 0; Abstain – 1 (Cook). The motion passed.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS: None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

Vice President Kohlstrand would like the resolution thanking Gina Mariani for her service on the Planning Board to be presented at the next Planning Board meeting. Mr. Thomas agreed, and noted that would take place.

11-A. Oral Status Report regarding the Alameda Point Advisory Task Force (Board Members Cook/Kohlstrand)

President Cook noted that there had been no further meetings.

11-B. Oral Status Report regarding the Oakland Chinatown Advisory Committee (Board Member McNamara)

Mr. Thomas noted there was nothing to report.

11-C. Oral Status Report regarding the Transportation Subcommittee (Board Member Kohlstrand)

Vice President Kohlstrand noted that there had been no further meetings since her last report.

President Cook requested that if there had been no further meetings under Board Communications, that they be removed from that meeting's agenda. Mr. Thomas concurred with that suggestion.

12. ADJOURNMENT: 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Thomas, Secretary
City Planning Board

This meeting was audio and video taped.